

**AMENDMENT**

**Attorney Docket No.: Case 7082**

**Patent Application Serial No. 10/830,123**  
**Reply to Office Action of Jan. 4, 2007**

---

**REMARKS / ARGUMENTS:**

The Examiner's Office Action mailed January 4, 2007 has been carefully reviewed. Reconsideration of this application, in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Examiner rejected Claims 1, 2, 4 and 10-17 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Haney et al. (US4650236). Examiner further rejected Claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haney et al.

Examiner however, objected to Claims 3 and 7-9 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicants have amended Claim 1 to include all the limitations of allowable Claim 3 and any intervening claims, thereby placing Claim 1 in condition for allowance. Accordingly Claims 4-18, by virtue of their dependence on allowable Claim 1, are also in condition for allowance. As all limitations of Claims 2 and 3 have been included in Claim 1 as amended, Claim 2 and 3 have been canceled.

Examiner rejected Claims 5-6 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Examiner states that Claim 5 recites "the pipe" in line 2 which lacks proper antecedent basis and that Claim 6 recites "the pipe" in line 2 which lacks proper antecedent basis.

**AMENDMENT**

**Patent Application Serial No. 10/830,123**  
**Reply to Office Action of Jan. 4, 2007**

**Attorney Docket No.: Case 7082**

---

Applicants have amended Claims 5 and 6 to depend upon Claim 4. Claim 4 recites "a pipe" in line 2, thereby providing proper antecedent basis for "the pipe" of Claim 5 and 6.

Examiner allowed Claims 19-20.

Accordingly, applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 3-5, and 7-16, as presented, are patentably distinct and non-obvious over the prior art references, taken separately or in combination. Applicant has endeavored to make the foregoing response sufficiently complete to permit prompt, favorable action on the subject patent application. In the event the Examiner believes, after consideration of this response, that the prosecution of the subject patent application would be expedited by an interview, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (330) 860-6605.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael J. Seymour  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No. 54,436

Date: June 28, 2007

The Babcock & Wilcox Company  
Patent Department  
P.O. Box 351  
20 South Van Buren Avenue  
Barberton, Ohio 44203